APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,115	08/10/2006	Michael Mohr	GRAT 22.694 (100717-00113	6055

26304	7590	07/09/2008

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER
HIGHTER, TREVILLIAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/09/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-10 and 12-14 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

1.   Claims 1-3, 8, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Schiff et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0158777), hereinafter Schiff, in

view of Duvall et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,033). Schiff is cited in the Information

Disclosure Statement filed by applicant on 8/10/2006.

2.   With respect to claim 1, Schiff discloses a central information server ([0064], lines

1-11) with an email interface unit ([0117], lines 4-10), a web interface unit ([0093], lines

1-6), a memory device ([0064], lines 1-7), and a selection device ([0114], lines 1-4,

when using a web browser, a selection device is apparent); the memory device

comprising an advertising memory unit storing a plurality of data emails (8) provided by

the plurality of data providers ([0064], lines 1-7);

a plurality of data processing systems (0074], lines 1-3), each of the plurality of

data processing systems being allocated to a respective one of the plurality of data

providers ([0065], lines 1-5; [0074], lines 1-3, providers are associated with a system

that sends data), each of the plurality of data processing systems comprising an email

interface in communication with one of a plurality of provider-specific email address

([0074], lines 1-3, email interface is part of a communication system); and

a plurality of portal servers ([0075], lines 1-3), each of the plurality of portal

servers comprising a web interface in communication with the web interface unit

([0075], lines 1-3, when providing users of portal servers with contents, a web interface

is apparent).

wherein the at least one data email is represented via a link on a homepage

([0075], lines 1-4, portals provide users with their own content is interpreted to incude

portals containing links to websites or data emails which are chosen for a particular

portal)

Schiff does not disclose the email interface unit comprising a plurality of provider-

specific email addresses for receiving the plurality of data emails form specific

providers; wherein the selection device comprises a memory unit for provider-specific

input concerning an identity of the portal servers with authorization to access data

emails form specific data providers; wherein the selection device automatically

determines the at least one data email for display to the receiver of the plurality of

receivers according to the respective portal server.

Duvall, however, disclosed the email interface unit comprising a plurality of

provider-specific email addresses for receiving the plurality of data emails form specific

providers (column 7, lines 61-67);

wherein the selection device comprises a memory unit (column 4, lines 22-40,

database stores filter entries; column 1, lines 59-64) for provider-specific input

concerning an identity of the portal servers with authorization to access data emails

form specific data providers (column 4, lines 22-37; column 1, lines 41-45; column 8,

lines 1-10);

wherein the selection device automatically determines the at least one data email

for display to the receiver of the plurality of receivers according to the respective portal

server (column 4, lines 22-37; column 1, lines 41-45; column 8, lines 1-10);

Both the systems of Schiff and Duvall provide methods to influence advertising

content of websites. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Schiff with teachings of

Duvall, in order to allow easy and effective communication to take place between

service providers and Internet users.

3.   With respect to claim 12, Schiff discloses preparation of a central information

server ([0064], lines 1-11) with an email interface unit ([0117], lines 4-10), a web

interface unit ([0093], lines 1-6) and a memory device ([0064], lines 1-7), the memory

device comprising at least one advertising memory unit ([0064], lines 1-7);

preparation of a plurality of portal servers ([0075], lines 1-3), each of the plurality

of portal servers comprising a web interface unit ([0075], lines 1-3, when providing users

of portal servers with contents, a web interface is apparent) and each of the plurality of

portal servers being connected to the web interface unit of the central information server

([0075], lines 1-3, when a portal server provides users with contents, a web interface in

apparent);

Sending advertising emails containing provider-specific data by means of a

plurality of data processing systems ([0074], lines 1-3), each of the plurality of data

processing systems being allocated to a data provider ([0065], lines 1-5; [0074], lines 1-

3, providers are associated with a system that send data), each of the advertising

emails being sent to the provider-specific email address of the central information server

([0074], lines 1-3, a communication system can be an email interface);

Automatic storage of the advertising emails ([0064], lines 1-7), which enter

central information server in advertising memory unit ([0074], lines 1-7);

Enabling the creation of connections between a plurality of data processing systems ([0074], lines 1-3), which are each allocated to one of the plurality of data receivers and feature a web interface, and central information server by using a link of one of the plurality of portal servers which is retrieved by the one of the plurality of data receivers ([0075], lines 1-3, portals provide users with their own content, therefore it is apparent that portal servers contain links to websites which are chosen for a particular portal. When accessing websites, use of data processing systems of providers and a central server that sends website to the user is apparent); and

access clearance to the advertising emails stored in the advertising memory unit ([0107], lines 10-12);

Retrieval of the selected and cleared advertising emails through the plurality of advertising receivers on the world wide web ([0107], lines 13-18).

Schiff does not disclose providing a memory unit for provider-specific input concerning an identity of the one of the plurality of portal servers with authorization to access the plurality of data emails from specific ones of the plurality of data providers; automatic selection of, which depends on the identity of the one of the plurality of portal servers,

Duvall, however discloses providing a memory unit (column 4, lines 22-40, database stores filter entries; column 1, lines 59-64) for provider-specific input concerning an identity of the one of the plurality of portal servers with authorization to access the plurality of data emails from specific ones of the plurality of data providers (column 4, lines 22-37; column 1, lines 41-45; column 8, lines 1-10); automatic selection

of, which depends on the identity of the one of the plurality of portal servers (column 4, lines 22-37; column 1, lines 41-45; column 8, lines 1-10),

Both the systems of Schiff and Duvall provide methods to influence advertising content in websites. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Schiff with teachings of Duvall, in order to allow easy and effective communication to take place between service providers and Internet users.

4.   With respect to claim 2, Schiff, discloses wherein the memory device of the central information server further comprises a provider database ([0064], lines 1-6) to prepare provider-specific data, wherein data emails from one provider and the provider-specific data of the same data provider are automatically associated with one another for each provider ([0064], lines 1-6, database is based on different scenarios).

5.   With respect to claim 3, Schiff, discloses provider-specific data, which are filed in the provider database, each contain a link to an Internet presence of the provider concerned ([0064], lines 5-6, content provided by the providers can include a link to an Internet presence of the provider).

6.   With respect to claim 8, Schiff discloses links of the individual portal servers access different, portal-specific websites, via which only the data emails can be retrieved, which are respectively chosen, specifically for the portal, by selection unit and

are released for access ([0075], lines 1-2, portals provide users with their own content,

therefore it is inherent that portal servers contain links to websites which are chosen for

a particular portal).

7.   With respect to claim 13, Schiff discloses retrievals of advertising emails by data

receivers is recorded and registered with allocation of the respectively used portal

server ([0119], lines 19-23).

8.   With respect to claim 14, Schiff discloses individual portal servers access

different, portal- specific websites via the respective link ([0075], lines 1-2, portals

provide users with their own content, therefore it is inherent that portal servers contain

links to websites which are chosen for a particular portal). Only the advertising emails,

which have been selected specifically for the portal and have been cleared for access,

are retrieved through these websites ([0107], lines 10-18).

9.   **Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Schiff, in view of Duvall, and further in view of East West Directory.Com,

hereinafter, East West Directory.**

10.   With respect to claim 5, Schiff and Duvall do not disclose wherein the selection

device further comprises a content selection module to select specific data emails,

which are stored in advertising memory unit and can be accessed via the respectively

used portal server. These data emails correspond to the content selection criteria

selected by the respective data receiver.

East West Directory discloses wherein the selection device further comprises a

content selection module to select specific data emails, which are stored in advertising

memory unit and can be accessed via the respectively used portal server (column 4,

lines 22-37; column 1, lines 41-45; column 8, lines 1-10). These data emails correspond

to the content selection criteria selected by the respective data receiver (column 4, lines

22-37; column 1, lines 41-45; column 8, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the teachings of Schiff and Duvall with teachings of East

West Directory, in order to offer customized information to the user.

11.   With respect to claim 6, the claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 5

above.   In addition, East West Directory discloses a selection device comprises a

content selection module to select such data emails, which are stored in advertising

memory unit and can be accessed via the respectively used portal server (page 2, no.

1, lines 34-37, when providing customized information, a content selection module is

inherent). These data emails correspond to the provider selection criteria selected by

the respective data receiver (page 2, no. 1, lines 34-37, when subscribing for or

purchasing a product or service, provider selection criteria is inherent).

12.   With respect to claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 5 above. In addition, East West Directory discloses a central information server comprises an action device to implement predetermined processes, which are selected by the respective data receiver in view of the respectively retrieved data emails allocated to providers (page 4, no. 4, lines 4-7, when performing online shopping, a predetermined purchasing process, an action device is inherent).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Schiff by incorporating a central information server, data processing systems and portal servers with implementing predetermined processes, in order to conveniently deliver products and services requested.

13.   Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schiff, in view of Duvall, and further in view of Olivier (US Patent No. 6,480,885), hereinafter Olivier. Olivier is cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed by applicant on 8/10/2006.

14.   With respect to claim 4, Schiff and Duvall do not disclose a memory device of the central information server comprises an archive to retrieve previous data emails.

Olivier, however, discloses a memory device of the central information server comprises an archive to retrieve previous data emails (column 8, lines 31-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Schiff and Duvall by incorporating a central information server, data processing systems and portal servers which access specific emails based on their identity with an archive, in order to allow users to browse the archives via a web interface.

With respect to claim 10, Schiff and Duvall discloses central information server contains a memory unit with the contact data relating to the link connection to the provider web servers ([0064], lines 5-6, content may contain contact data, as disclosed by Schiff), and whereby the portal servers have access to provider data records via the information server from specific providers which are detected by the selection device depending on the identity of the respective portal server (column 4, lines 22-37; column 1, lines 41-45; column 8, lines 1-10, as disclosed by Duvall), and can thereby display these provider data records via a link on a homepage ([0075], lines 1-4, portals provide users with their own content, therefore it is apparent that portals contain links to websites or data emails which are chosen for a particular portal, as disclosed by Duvall).

Schiff and Duvall do not disclose a few provider data processing systems each comprise a web server with a web interface unit and a memory device accessible via the web interface unit for provider- specific data records stored in an Internet-compatible format.

Olivier, however, discloses a few provider data processing systems each comprise a web server with a web interface unit (column 5, lines 7-8) and a memory device (column 5, lines 1-2) accessible via the web interface unit for provider- specific data records stored in an Internet-compatible format.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Schiff and Duvall by incorporating a central information server, data processing systems and portal servers which access specific emails based on their identity with provider systems containing web servers and memory as taught by Olivier, in order to in order to offer customized information to the user.

15.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schiff, in view of Duvall, and further in view of Wiederin et. al. (US Patent No. 7,069,446 B2), hereinafter Wiederin.

16.   With respect to claim 9, Schiff and Duvall do not disclose multiple content-specific email addresses are allocated to individual providers on the email interface unit of the central information server.

Wiederin, however, discloses multiple content-specific email addresses are allocated to individual providers on the email interface unit of the central information server (column 7, lines 3-5 and 10-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Schiff and Duvall by incorporating a central information server, data processing systems and portal servers which access specific emails based on their identity with allocating multiple email address to data providers, in order to tailor to the particular needs of customers.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments, with regards to claims 1 and 12, filed 8 February 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3.   On page 12, of the Applicant's response, applicant argues "both references rely on conventional means of delivering advertising to users...since these methods are mutually exclusive, each of the cited references renders the other unworkable, or more particularly, East-West Directory render Schiff unworkable."

In response to the applicant's argument, both the systems of Schiff and Duvall provide methods to influence advertising content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Schiff with the teachings of Duvall, in order to allow easy and effective communication to take place between service providers and Internet users.

4.   On page 13 of the Applicant's Response, applicant argues that "the portal

servers have access to specific data emails, which are stored in an advertising memory

of a central server."

In response to the applicant's argument, Duvall suggests portal servers have

access to specific data emails since the filtering system can be based on different

scenarios (column 4,lines 22-40, a different scenario may include the filtering system

can filter outgoing messages on the basis of the portal server address/ID).

In addition, Schiff disclosed data emails are stored in an advertising memory of a

central information server ([0064], lines 1-7).

Applicant also argues that "the selection of data emails (or other advertising

means) depending on the identity of the portal server."

In response to the applicant's argument, Duvall suggests "the selection of data

emails (or other advertising means) depending on the identity of the portal server" since

the filtering system can be based on different scenarios (column 4, lines 22-40, a

different scenario may include the filtering system can filter outgoing messages on the

basis of the portal server address/ID).

5.   Applicant also argues on page 13, that "East-West Directory, in fact, fails to fill

the gap of permit one skilled in the art to adapt Schiff to a different outcome."

In response to the applicant's argument, both the systems of Schiff and Duvall

provide methods to influence advertising content. Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of

Schiff with the teachings of Duvall, in order to allow easy and effective communication

to take place between service providers and Internet users.

6.   In the present application, Applicant also argues, on page 13 of the remarks, that

"the selection device comprises a memory unit for provider-specific input concerning the

identity of the portal servers with authorization to access the data emails from specific

data providers."

In response to the applicant's argument, Duvall suggests the selection device

comprises a memory unit (column 4, lines 22-40, database that store filter entries;

column 1, lines 59-64) for provider-specific input concerning the identity of the portal

servers with authorization to access the data emails from specific data providers

(column 4, lines 22-40, a different scenario may include the filtering system can filter

outgoing messages on the basis of the portal server address/ID).

7.   Applicant also argues on page 13, that "a portal-identity-specific selection of data

emails (advertising) to be displayed."

In response to the applicant's argument, on page 13, Duvall suggest a portal-

identity-specific selection of data emails (advertising) to be displayed since the filtering

system may be based on different scenarios (column 4, lines 22-40, a different scenario

may include the filtering system can filter outgoing messages on the basis of the portal

server address/ID).

8.   In the present application, Applicant also argues, on page 13 of the remarks, that
"a distribution of data emails as required by the limitations of all independent claims and
that further thereto no selection of data or data emails will be displayed based on the
identity of a portal server."

In response to the applicant's argument, on page 13, Duvall suggests "a
distribution of data emails" since the filtering system may be based on different
scenarios (column 4, lines 22-40, a different scenario may include the filtering system
can filter outgoing messages on the basis of the portal server address/ID).

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in
this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP 706.07(a).
Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within
TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not
mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the
shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any
extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TREVILLIAN HIGHTER whose telephone number is (571)270-3806. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3984. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.3/31

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

THH 7-1-2008
Art Unit 2151

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151